## UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

## WESTERN DISTRICT OF TENNESSEE

## WESTERN DIVISION

In re ACCREDO HEALTH, INC. SECURITIES LITIGATION	) Civil Action No. 03-2216-BBD
	) ) <u>CLASS ACTION</u>
This Document Relates To:	) LEAD PLAINTIFFS' MOTION <i>IN LIMINE</i>
ALL ACTIONS.	#13 TO PRECLUDE THE PRESENCE OF PERCIPIENT WITNESSES IN THE
	COURTROOM UNLESS THEY ARE
	TESTIFYING AND TO PROHIBIT
	COUNSEL AND WITNESSES FROM
	COMMUNICATING WITH PERCIPIENT
	WITNESSES WHO HAVE NOT YET
	TESTIFIED

Lead Plaintiffs, Louisiana School Employees' Retirement System and Debra Swiman (together, "Lead Plaintiffs") and the Class of investors who purchased Accredo stock between June 16, 2002 and April 7, 2003, respectfully ask the Court to exclude percipient witnesses from the courtroom to prevent them from hearing the testimony of other witnesses, under Fed. R. Evid. 615, and likewise to prohibit counsel and witnesses from communicating with percipient witnesses who have yet to testify.

Plaintiffs request that the Court exclude percipient witnesses from the courtroom to prevent them from hearing the testimony of other witnesses. Pursuant to Fed. R. Evid. 615, "[a]t the request of a party the court *shall* order witnesses excluded so that they cannot hear the testimony of other witnesses." As the language makes clear, it is a party's right under Fed. R. Evid. 615 to prohibit discussion between and among witnesses, "to prevent the influencing of a witness' testimony by another witness." *United States v. Ruiz Solorio*, 337 F.3d 580, 592 (6th Cir. 2003). *See also United States v. Green*, 305 F.3d 422, 428 (6th Cir. 2002) (observing that Rule 615 "serves two purposes: (1) it prevents witnesses from tailoring testimony to that of other witnesses; and (2) it aids in detecting false testimony"); *United States v. Rugiero*, 20 F.3d 1387, 1392 (6th Cir. 1994) ("The statutory purpose of the rule requiring sequestration of witnesses is to preclude coaching or the influencing of a witness' testimony by another witness."). The Court should extend the sequestration provision to opening statements, because the opening remarks at trial can be as effective in suggesting to one witness the tone of the testimony by another as hearing the testimony itself. *See* 29 Charles A. Wright & Victor J. Gold, *Federal Practice & Procedure: Evidence* §6243

All emphasis added, and all internal quotations and citations omitted, unless otherwise noted.

<sup>&</sup>quot;The Advisory Committee Notes to [Rule 615] indicate that the rule was designed to make the exclusion of witnesses *a matter of right* rather than a matter of judicial discretion." *William L. Comer Family Equity Pure Trust v. Comm'r*, 958 F.2d 136, 140 (6th Cir. 1992).

(2007) (policies underlying Fed. R. Evid. 615 suggest the rule may be invoked to exclude witnesses during opening statements because the statements typically refer to testimony expected at trial); *see also United States v. Moore*, 93 Fed. Appx. 887, 894 (6th Cir. 2004) (observing, without disapproval, that "the district court invoked Rule 615 before opening statements").

Logically, an order excluding witnesses from the courtroom for the purposes of insulating them from others' testimony would be meaningless if they nonetheless learned of the testimony from other persons, including other witnesses or a party's counsel. Accordingly, the Court should admonish counsel and witnesses in this trial, subject to the Court's inherent authority to sanction, that they are prohibited from communicating with any percipient witness who has not yet testified about his or her testimony or any other testimony that has been given.

Indeed, sequestering fact witnesses from the courtroom reduces the risk of fabrication, collusion and inaccuracy, and should occur during opening and closing statements to fulfill Rule 615's purpose of promoting honest and accurate testimony, unaffected by the remarks or statements of others. *Solorio*, 337 F.3d at 592; *Green*, 305 F.3d at 428; *Rugiero*, 20 F.3d at 1392; *see also* 4 Jack B. Weinstein & Margaret A. Berger, *Weinstein's Evidence Manual* §615.02 (2d 2008). As the Supreme Court has noted:

It is a common practice for a judge to instruct a witness not to discuss his or her testimony with third parties until the trial is completed. Such nondiscussion orders are a corollary of the broader rule that witnesses may be sequestered to lessen the danger that their testimony will be influenced by hearing what other witnesses have to say, and to increase the likelihood that they will confine themselves to truthful statements based on their own recollections.

*Perry v. Leeke*, 488 U.S. 272, 281-82 (1989). Here, plaintiffs may be prejudiced if the Court allows adverse witnesses to observe each other's testimony and consult with defense counsel before testifying. This is especially true here as plaintiffs will present important aspects of their case through adverse witnesses (*e.g.*, Defendants, former employees of Defendants or third-parties aligned with Defendants). While the exact reach of Fed. R. Evid. 615 is an unresolved matter in the

Sixth Circuit, it is notable that the Sixth Circuit suggested in *dicta* that Fed. R. Evid. 615 *does* extend beyond the courtroom. *See Rugiero*, 20 F.3d at 1394 ("[W]e think it unnecessary, once the rule is invoked, that either party need ask the court to instruct each witness not to discuss his testimony with another witness yet to testify."). Accordingly, and wholly consistent with the two purposes of Fed. R. Evid. 615, the Court should admonish counsel and witnesses in this trial, subject to the Court's inherent authority to sanction and sequester, that they are prohibited from communicating with any percipient witness who has not yet testified about his or her testimony or any other testimony that has been given. *See also Geders v. United States*, 425 U.S. 80, 87 (1976) ("The judge's power to control the progress and, within the limits of the adversary system, the shape of the trial includes broad power to sequester witnesses before, during, and after their testimony.").

Of course, plaintiffs do not move to exclude the parties, their expert witnesses or to prohibit counsel from communicating with clients who are parties. "In general, Federal Rule of Evidence 615 requires that witnesses be sequestered when sequestration is requested by one of the parties, except when the witness is: (1) a party who is a natural person, or (2) *an* officer or employee of a party which is not a natural person designated as its representative by its attorney, or (3) a person whose presence is shown by a party to be essential to the presentation of the party's cause, or (4) a person authorized by statute to be present." *Roberts v. Galen of Va., Inc.*, 325 F.3d 776, 784 (6th Cir. 2003) (quoting Fed. R. Evid. 615). The corporate defendant Accredo, however, should not be permitted to skirt Fed. R. Evid. 615 by designating representatives who are identified witnesses to sit in the courtroom. Accordingly, Lead Plaintiffs request that the Court prohibit Accredo from naming as its representative any person who has been identified as a potential witness in this case.

DATED: September 8, 2008 Respectfully submitted,

COUGHLIN STOIA GELLER RUDMAN & ROBBINS LLP MARK SOLOMON TOR GRONBORG JONAH H. GOLDSTEIN DAVID W. MITCHELL TRIG R. SMITH NATHAN W. BEAR

# s/ TOR GRONBORG TOR GRONBORG

655 West Broadway, Suite 1900 San Diego, CA 92101 Telephone: 619/231-1058 619/231-7423 (fax)

BERNSTEIN LITOWITZ BERGER & GROSSMANN LLP
BLAIR A. NICHOLAS
TIMOTHY A. DELANGE
BRETT M. MIDDLETON
MATTHEW P. JUBENVILLE
12481 High Bluff Drive, Suite 300
San Diego, CA 92130
Telephone: 858/793-0070
858/793-0323 (fax)

Co-Lead Counsel for Plaintiffs

GLASSMAN, EDWARDS, WADE & WYATT, P.C. B.J. WADE, #5182 26 N. Second Street Building Memphis, TN 38103 Telephone: 901/527-4673 901/521-0940 (fax)

Liaison Counsel

C:\Program Files\DocsCorp\pdfDocs PDF\users\MicheleH\Import\brf00053881 mil1.doc

## CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that on September 8, 2008, I electronically filed the foregoing with the Clerk of the Court using the CM/ECF system which will send notification of such filing to the e-mail addresses denoted on the attached Electronic Mail Notice List, and I hereby certify that I have mailed the foregoing document or paper via the United States Postal Service to the non-CM/ECF participants indicated on the attached Manual Notice List.

I certify under penalty of perjury under the laws of the United States of America that the foregoing is true and correct. Executed on September 8, 2008.

s/ TOR GRONBORG

TOR GRONBORG

COUGHLIN STOIA GELLER RUDMAN & ROBBINS LLP 655 West Broadway, Suite 1900 San Diego, CA 92101-3301 Telephone: 619/231-1058 619/231-7423 (fax)

E-mail: torg@csgrr.com

## Mailing Information for a Case 2:03-cv-02216-BBD-gbc

## **Electronic Mail Notice List**

The following are those who are currently on the list to receive e-mail notices for this case.

- George E. Barrett gbarrett@barrettjohnston.com
- Nathan W. Bear NBear@csgrr.com,stremblay@csgrr.com
- Saul C. Belz sbelz@glankler.com,apospisil@glankler.com
- Paul Kent Bramlett pknashlaw@aol.com
- Linda F Burnsed lburnsed@cbslawyers.net
- Karen M. Campbell kcampbell@appersoncrump.com
- F. Guthrie Castle, Jr fgc@castle-law.com
- Stanley M. Chernau s.chernau@chernau.com
- Timothy A. DeLange timothyd@blbglaw.com,brettm@blbglaw.com,samj@blbglaw.com,kristinas@blbglaw.com,matthe
- Amy Ferguson Dudek adudek@glankler.com,apospisil@glankler.com
- Jef Feibelman jfeibelman@bpjlaw.com,cbiscoe@bpjlaw.com
- Tor Gronborg torg@csgrr.com,e\_file\_sd@csgrr.com
- Douglas F. Halijan dhalijan@bpjlaw.com,mmarshall@bpjlaw.com
- Dixie W. Ishee woodcarltonishee@bellsouth.net

## • Matthew P. Jubenville matthewj@blbglaw.com

- Emily C. Komlossy ekomlossy@faruqilaw.com
- Quitman Robins Ledyard, II bledyard@borodandkramer.com
- Brett M. Middleton brettm@blbglaw.com
- Timothy L. Miles tmiles@barrettjohnston.com
- David W. Mitchell davidm@csgrr.com
- Blair N. Nicholas blairn@blbglaw.com
- Russell F.A. Riviere russellr@blbglaw.com
- **Kevin Hunter Sharp** ksharp@dsattorneys.com
- Scott N. Sherman scott.sherman@alston.com
- Gary K. Smith gsmith@appersoncrump.com,clunsford@appersoncrump.com,kcampbell@appersoncrump.com
- Trig R. Smith trigs@csgrr.com
- Mark D. Trainer mark.trainer@alston.com
- **B. J. Wade** bwade@gewwlaw.com
- Allison Wannamaker wannamakera@thomasonlaw.com
- Kelly C. Wilcove kelly.wilcove@alston.com,valerie.nouman@alston.com

## **Manual Notice List**

The following is the list of attorneys who are **not** on the list to receive e-mail notices for this case (who therefore require manual noticing). You may wish to use your mouse to select and copy this list into your word processing program in order to create notices or labels for these recipients.

#### Ramzi Abadou

LERACH COUGHLIN STOIA GELLER RUDMAN & ROBBINS, LLP 655 West Broadway Suite 1900 San Diego, CA 92101

#### Guri Ademi

ADEMI & O'REILLY, LLP 3620 East Layton Ave. Cudahy, WI 53110

#### Shpetim Ademi

ADEMI & O'REILLY, LLP 3620 East Layton Ave. Cudahy, WI 53110

#### Lauren S. Antonino

CHITWOOD & HARLEY 1230 Peachtree St., N.E. 2900 Promenade II Atlanta, GA 30309

## Peter Q. Bassett

ALSTON & BIRD 1201 West Peachtree St. Atlanta, GA 30309-3424

#### Javier Bleichmar

BERNSTEIN LITOWITZ BERGER & GROSSMAN 1285 Ave of the Americas 38th Floor New York, NY 10019

## Martin D. Chitwood

CHITWOOD HARLEY & HARNES LLP 1230 Peachtree St., N.E. 2900 Promenade II Atlanta, GA 30309

#### Patricia A. Connell

ERNST & YOUNG 5 Times Square New York, NY 10036-6530

#### Gregory M. Egleston

BERNSTEIN LIEBHARD & LIFSHITZ, LLP 10 East 40th Street New York, NY 10016

#### Nadeem Faruqi

FARUQI & FARUQI, LLP 369 Lexington Avenue 10th Floor New York, NY 10017

, Esq

## Mark C. Gardy

ABBEY GARDY, LLP 212 East 39th St. New York, NY 10016

#### Carol V. Gilden

MUCH SHELIST FREED DENENBERG AMENT & RUBENSTEIN, P.C. 191 N. Wacker Dr. Ste. 1800 Chicago, IL 60606-1615

#### Karen M. Hanson

LOCKRIDGE GRINDAL NAUEN, PLLP 100 Washington Ave., South Ste. 2200 Minneapolis, MN 55401

#### Ronald B. Hauben

ERNST & YOUNG 5 Times Square New York, NY 10036-6530

#### Marc S. Henzel

LAW OFFICES OF MARC S. HENZEL 273 Montgomery Ave. Ste. 202 Bala Cynwyd, PA 19004

#### Fred Taylor Isquith

WOLF HALDENSTEIN ADLER FREEMAN & HERZ LLP 270 Madison Ave.
New York, NY 10016

#### Douglas S. Johnston

BARRETT JOHNSTON & PARSLEY 217 Second Avenue North Nashville, TN 37201-1601

## Nancy Kaboolian

ABBEY GARDY, LLP 212 East 39th St. New York, NY 10016

#### William S. Lerach

LERACH COUGHLIN STOIA GELLER RUDMAN & ROBBINS, LLP 655 West Broadway Suite 1900 San Diego, CA 92101

#### Mel E. Lifshitz

BERNSTEIN LIEBHARD & LIFSHITZ, LLP 10 East 40th Street New York, NY 10016

## Richard A. Lockridge

LOCKRIDGE GRINDAL NAUEN, PLLP 100 Washington Ave., South Ste. 2200 Minneapolis, MN 55401

, Esq

### Douglas M McKeige

BERNSTEIN LITOWITZ BERGER & GROSSMAN 1285 Ave of the Americas 38th Floor New York, NY 10019

#### Eitan Misulovin

BERNSTEIN LITOWITZ BERGER & GROSSMAN 1285 Ave of the Americas 38th Floor
New York, NY 10019

#### Michael E. Moskovitz

MUCH SHELIST FREED DENENBERG AMENT & RUBENSTEIN, P.C. 191 N. Wacker Dr. Ste. 1800 Chicago, IL 60606-1615

#### Gregory M. Nespole

WOLF HALDENSTEIN ADLER FREEMAN & HERZ LLP 270 Madison Ave. New York, NY 10016

#### Darren J Robbins

LERACH COUGHLIN STOIA GELLER RUDMAN & ROBBINS, LLP 655 W. Broadway Ste. 1900 San Diego, CA 92101

#### Robert M. Roseman

SPECTOR ROSEMAN & KODROFF, P.C. 1818 Market St. Ste. 2500 Philadelphia, PA 19103

#### David A. Rosenfeld

LERACH COUGHLIN STOIA GELLER RUDMAN & ROBBINS, LLP 200 Broadhollow Rd. Ste. 406 Melville, NY 11747

#### Samuel H. Rudman

LERACH COUGHLIN STOIA GELLER RUDMAN & ROBBINS, LLP 200 Broadhollow Rd. Ste. 406 Melville, NY 11747

#### Mark Solomon

LERACH COUGHLIN STOIA GELLER RUDMAN & ROBBINS, LLP 655 West Broadway Suite 1900 San Diego, CA 92101

#### Marc A. Topaz

SCHIFFRIN BARROWAY TOPAZ & KESSLER, LLP 280 King of Prussia Road Radnor, PA 19087